

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-33 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 18, and 20 has been amended.

*Double Patenting*

Claims 1 and 18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being patentable over Claims 1 and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,287,041 (Attorney Docket Number OIC0100US). Applicants have amended Claims 1, 18, and 20. Applicants respectfully assert that the provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is moot because the amendments render Claims 1 and 18 patentably distinct over Claims 1 and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,287,041. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the provisional rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 and 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being patentable over Claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 12 of co-pending Patent Application No. 10/696,371. As previously discussed, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 18, and 20. Applicants respectfully assert that the provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is moot because the amendments render independent Claims 1, 18 and 20 patentably distinct over Claims 1, 9, 12 of co-pending Patent Application No. 10/696,371. Claims 2-3 and 19 of the instant application are also patentable over Claims 2-3 and 10 of co-pending Patent Application No. 10/696,371 by virtue of the dependency of Claims 2-3 and 19 of the instant

application on amended Claims 1, 18, and 20. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

*Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. 102*

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by Jost et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,778,651 B1 (Jost). Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 18, and 20 to recite “wherein the service request information comprises a report of a loss of a service from a customer.” The cited passages of Jost do not disclose, teach, or suggest the recited element of the independent claims.

For example, Jost discloses “a request representative of a service order for at least one communications service associated with a subscriber number from at least one service order source.” Col. 6, lines 1-4 of Jost. A request that is a service order for at least one communications service is clearly not “a report of a loss of a service from a customer,” as recited in the independent claims. The cited passages of Jost disclose a request for at least one communications service to be provided. In stark contrast, the independent claims recite a report of a service outage (loss of service).

Therefore, the cited passages of Jost do not disclose (or render obvious) each and every element of independent Claims 1, 18, and 20. Independent Claim 1, similar independent Claim 18 and 20 and all dependent claims are thus patentable over Jost. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Page 9 of the present Office Action asserts that col. 6, lines 50-54 of Jost discloses “using the service request information in the target form to perform at least one

computer-implemented act from a set of computer-implemented acts.” Col. 6, lines 50-54 of Jost states:

According to another aspect, the input process determines if the request contains errors, and if so, the input process corrects the errors and populates the database system with the raw data based on the request.

Upon closer reading of the cited passages in Jost, the recited “input process” refers to “an input process” of the “order management system”. Col. 6, lines 19-20 of Jost. The input process “accepts input data from the at least one service order source” (data in a first form) and stores the data related to the requests in a hierarchical format (data in a second form). Col. 6, lines 10-13 of Jost. Turning to col. 6, lines 50-54 of Jost, the input process determines if the request (data in a first form) contains errors, and if so, the input process corrects the errors and populates the database system with the raw data based on the request (data in a second form).

However, nothing in the cited passages of Jost disclose, teach, or even suggest “using the service request information in the target form,” as recited in Claims 2 and 19. As recited in independent Claim 1 and 18 (from which Claims 2 and 19 depend), the service request information in a first form, which is associated with a first source computerized service request management system is extracted and converted to a second intermediate form (service request information in a second form). The “target computerized service request management system” receives service request information that is converted from the “second intermediate form” (service request information in a second form) into “a target form” (service request information in a third form). Thus, the cited passages simply cannot disclose, teach, or suggest the recited elements of Claims 2

and 19 because the cited passages refer to data that has been transformed one time (from the request (data in a first form) to the raw data based on the request (data in a second form) while the recited elements of Claims 2 and 19 (when read in conjunction with independent Claims 1 and 18) refer to data (“service request information in the target form”) that has been transformed twice (from a first form, to a second form, to a third (target) form).

Since cited passages do not disclose, teach, or even suggest the recited elements of Claims 2 and 19, Claims 2 and 19 are patentable over the cited passages of Jost. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric A. Stephenson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,321  
Telephone: (512) 439-5093  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099